

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 35 and 36 and leaves claim 37 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 35-37.

In paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to claim 36 as containing an informality. Amendments were made to claim 36 to correct the informality noted by the Examiner. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 35-37 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabinovich (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,675) in view of Olson (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,980) and in view of Hammond (U.S. Patent No. 5,758,337). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited in claims 35-37 are not taught or suggested by Rabinovich, Olson or Hammond whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims so as to more clearly recite that the data warehouse system includes a plurality of client devices, a server, a data collector and a network for collecting the client devices to the server via the data collector. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to more clearly recite that the data collector is separate from the server.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Rabinovich, Olson or Hammond

whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Numerous arguments distinguishing the features of the present invention as recited in the claims are provided in the Remarks of the October 2, 2003 Amendment. The contents of said Remarks are incorporated herein by reference.

Particularly, Rabinovich fails to teach or suggest the data collector as recited in the claims. In the Office Action the Examiner alleges that the request distributor 101 corresponds to the data collector, yet the Examiner seems to refer to the functions performed in each host (server) 103 regarding the replica stored therein as corresponding to the functions and elements recited in the claims with respect to the data collector. However, the replica management instructions 113 and replica 115 as provided in the server 103 are in fact fully integrated functions performed by the server 103. The request distributor 101 as taught by Rabinovich merely distributes requests from a requestor 109 to the servers 103, 104 and 105 and as such does not perform any replication functions as recited in the claims.

Thus, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Rabinovich of a data collector which performs the replication functions and that the data collector is separate from the server as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Rabinovich that the data collector is provided with a storage and that such storage stores the replica of a database which is provided as part of the server. In Rabinovich the request distributor contains a memory but such memory simply stores request distribution instructions 108. Rabinovich teaches servers 103 but each server 103 has a

memory 112, a replica 115 and replica management instructions 113. Thus, in Rabinovich the replica is stored in the server rather than at the data collector as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Rabinovich fails to teach or suggest a data collector, which is separate from the server and associated with the client devices and is provided with a storage device, for collecting data requested by users of the client devices and storing the data in the storage device of the data collector as a replica which is partially replicating the database provided in the server as recited in the claims.

The above noted deficiencies of Rabinovich are not supplied by any of the other references of record namely Olson and Hammond. Therefore, combining the teachings of Rabinovich with Olson and Hammond in the manner suggested by the Examiner still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 35-37 is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 35-37.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 35-37 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 35-37 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (501.37841X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP


Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 312-6600